Insight & Beyond II, Lecture 15, Part I: Chapter 19 §§10 & 11 "Affirmation of God" and "Comparisons and Contrasts" Revisited;
Chapter 20: "Special Transcendent Knowledge" §§1-5

[0.00]
• Return to student question in Lecture 14 (4/28/2010), Part I [21:33] regarding Lonergan's proof for the existence of an unrestricted act of understanding (God)
• Student did not see the need for the addition of a premise about a contingent fact
• Original interpretation of Lonergan's argument summarized

[3:36]
• Lonergan does present the issue of contingency in §8 "Causality" and again in §11 "Comparisons and Contrasts"

[4:53]
• Correction of a mistake from previous class:
• Lonergan's actual argument in §10 "The Affirmation of God":
• If being is the real, and being is completely intelligible, then the idea of being exists, therefore the unrestricted act of understanding exists
• Reprise of why being is reality and dialectical interferences that produce conter-positions
• Discussion of Lonergan's actual argument

[10:15]
• Student question about the relationship between the notion of being and the idea of being
    – The idea of being is what the notion of being desires to grasp

[11:15]
• Both proofs – Lonergan's actual proof in §10 and Byrne's reconstructed argument – are valid proofs
• Neither is vulnerable to Lonergan criticisms of the "ontological argument"
• The complete intelligibility of being is probably implicit in Aquinas's cosmological arguments

[13:17]
• Chapter 20: "Special Transcendent Knowledge":
• Recapitulation of "The Problem" for Special Transcendent Knowledge
• Emphasis on the importance of taking into account really long term consequences and the problem of general bias in arriving at universal willingness
• Recent examples of failures to consider long-term issues

[19:24]
• The unrestricted desire to know found in all human beings
• It is natural and spontaneous; it can be blocked but not destroyed
• Universal willingness to cooperate with that desire, however, is neither spontaneous nor a natural endowment.
• It needs to be developed, and its attainment is quite difficult
• An attitude toward the universe of being that is manifested in performances
• Universal willingness about all that is intelligible = love of God

 [24:46]
• The problem of the failure to achieve universal willingness

• Introduces into the world a unique kind of unintelligibility – the social surd – which is not compensated by anything treated in the previous 19 chapters

[27:52]
• Because God exists, there is an intelligibility that meets the problem of evil
• What can be known about this further intelligibility is the topic of Chapter 20
• Contrast of two ways of formulating the problem of evil

[30:47]
• The further intelligibility that meets the problem of evil can be humanly known only heuristically
• The 31 points in the heuristic structure of God's solution to the problem of evil – special transcendent knowledge as a heuristic structure
    – The solution is one and universal (1&2)
    – The relation of the solution to emergent probablility – finality of proportionate being (3-12)
    – Supernatural conjugate forms: charity, hope, faith (13-15)
    – Higher conjugates, higher collaboration, human and divine (16-31)
• The problem of liberation emerges within finality, so the solution has to be harmonious with emergent probability
• There are no afterthoughts in God

[34:40]
• Climax of Chapter 20 ("in the 16th and 17th place") immediately follows the discussion of the conjugate forms of charity, faith and hope, with a tangential discussion of believing
• The solution has to have the structure of a higher integration, a collaboration among human beings – and between human beings and God – working together on the problem of evil
• Charity, faith and hope are the resources needed for that collaboration
• Emergent probability means that earlier stages of civilization (i.e., human collaboration) set the conditions for the emergence of later forms of civilization
• Finality becomes conscious and collaborative at the human level
• Were it not for the problem of human evil, this process would be unmitigated progress
• But bias and evil mean that the natural process of emergent probability might never realize its full potential
• Teilhard de Chardin lacked an adequate way of addressing his way of thinking about finality to evil
• This is what Lonergan does by means of the heuristic notion of the human-divine collaboration

[41:49]
• The nature of and need for new higher, transcendent, "supernatural" conjugate forms as resources for the higher collaboration ("in the 5th and 7th place")
• Conjugate forms as the grounds for relationships
• A collaboration on the basis of kinds of relationships not considered previously in *Insight*

[44:46]
• Charity ("in the 13th place"): a new, higher conjugate form of willingness that is love of God
• Hope ("in the 14th place"): a form of willingness that encourages intellect to keep trying – against the apparent evidence that workable solutions to the accumulation of evil cannot be found
• Faith ("in the 15th place"): need for a form of knowledge to overcome counter-positions

[49:16]
• §4.3: Analysis of Believing:

• Believing possible because truth is unconditioned
• Truth does not depend upon particular people, and so can be communicated
• Contrast with mainstream analytic philosophy and its concept of knowledge as justified true belief
• For Lonergan, believing is grounded in n act of deciding, rather than in a reflective understanding of a virtually unconditioned
• This moves the issue back to the grounds for deciding to believe a proposition uttered by someone else
• Lonergan is concerned with the believing that grounds human collaboration (even apart from the higher, supernatural collaboration between God and humanity)

[55:12]
• Lonergan's accounts of scientific and commonsense knowledge is really incomplete, until it is supplemented by the account of believing
• Most of our scientific and commonsense "knowledge" is actually knowing-by-believing, not knowledge we come to by our own personal immanently generated knowledge
• Stages in deciding to believe:
    – Person P knows by own immanently generated knowledge that proposition X is so
    – Person Q affirms in general the social value of believing
    – Person Q reaches a virtually unconditioned grasp of the value in this particular case of affirming P does knows that proposition X is so
    – There is no formula or algorithm for this. It is a matter of maturity, acquiring prior insights and judgments as the background for grasping the virtually unconditioned grounds for a particular judgment of the value of believing in this concrete case
    – Person Q makes the judgment of value that it is good to believe person P about X
    – This is the *rational* ground for believing
    – Person Q decides to believe in this concrete case
    – Person Q assents to X on the basis of that decision

[1:02:15]
• Student question about the relationship between judging the accuracy of a communication, and the hermeneutical task of understanding the communication
    – The prior task of correctly understanding another's expression is presupposed by the analysis of believing the expression

[1:04:00]
• Student question about different levels of self-involvement in the tasks of believing – e.g., that the personal demands for believing a scientific statement are less involved than those involved in believing in the realms of common sense, especially the affective dimensions in intersubjectivity
    – The natural sciences *seem* less to involve believing, because they do not investigate the realm that is not only mediated but also constituted by meaning
    – Hence, the biases that are awakened by encounters with the meanings and biases of other humans are less in play in natural scientific investigations; but they are not absent
    – After *Insight* Lonergan attends more to the role of feelings in arriving at judgments of value which also intensifies believing in the context of the realm constituted by meaning
    – The real and important role of being in love as the source of value judgments is not explicitly discussed in Chapter 20
    – Universal doubt is not a solution to false belief; Lonergan adopts a different approach

[1:12:25]

• Student question about how Lonergan avoids the position that evil is a necessary outcome of the unfolding of finality
   – Lonergan contends that there is no causality of evil
   – There is no reason why – there is no cause – for evil
   – (Hence, evil is not caused by finality)

[1:14:16]
• Student question about whether it is necessary to distinguish between immanently generated knowledge and belief, or whether it is all right to have both
   – It is all right to have both, but there will be times when it is important to recognize the distinction
   – For example, if it is assumed that knowledge is science and belief is other than science, this is a serious mistake
   – Self-appropriation is a matter of learning to be faithful to the demands of the unrestricted desire to know, whether those have to do with the grounds of affirming on the basis of immanently generated knowledge, or on the basis of believing
   – Self-appropriation is also a matter of learning about the gift of unconditional love, its demands, and its ways of grounding knowledge and belief

[1:16:18]
• Lessons in Love:
• Lonergan's comments about the higher collaboration, the higher intelligibility that meets the problem of evil
• Contrast with Kant: unconditionally good will is God, and the good human will is the love of God
• There is much that passes for religion that is really self-serving, and not motivated by love of God
• The good will says "Yes" to the strange, unconditioned universe in all its uncontrollable and unpredictable events
• Lonergan's equivalent of Nietzsche's affirmation of the eternal return
• Unconditional love as willing every thing because of the good of order of the universes, and wills the good of the universe because of the love of God
• This means to love all persons because of the love of God
• Unconditional love means developing a "dialectical attitude" toward the social surd, and to transform evil into good through self-sacrificing love

End of Part I.